

# SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

## MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

January 29, 2003

WestCoast Sea-Tac Hotel, Seattle Room  
SeaTac, Washington

---

### ***SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:***

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
Sara LaBorde	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Shari Schafflein	Designee, Department of Transportation
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

---

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the regular meeting at 10:38 a.m.

The agenda was approved as presented.

### **MANAGEMENT AND STATUS REPORTS**

Approval of Minutes: Larry Cassidy moved to approve the November 2002 SRFB Meeting Minutes as presented. Steve Tharinger seconded the motion. Minutes were approved as presented.

#### Management Status Reports:

##### ***Director's Report***

Director Laura Johnson updated the Board on status of the Biennial Report and gave a brief overview of its layout.

Director Johnson showed the Board a notebook of before and after pictures of SRFB funded projects. As of May 2002, staff is now able to attach photos to the projects in the PRISM database.

Director Johnson informed the Board of the legislative overview she recently presented.

Sara LaBorde discussed the WDFW salmon status report; this is another one of the set of salmon recovery update documents and should be available after February 5.

Today's meeting is in WRIA 9. A map showing past SRFB funded projects in the area was displayed.

## ***Financial Report***

Debra Wilhelmi presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Ms. Wilhelmi presented the Board with a new Board travel policy. This policy reflects current OFM travel policy issues. Brenda McMurray moved to approve Board Policy #B2003-01. Steve Tharinger seconded. Board approved Board Travel Policy #B2003-01.

Bill Ruckelshaus asked Director Johnson when the Board will find out the amount of federal funding for the 4<sup>th</sup> Round. Ms. Johnson explained that the Congress still doesn't have a budget but it is getting closer to final.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked the Board members and staff to thank our congressional delegation for the hard work they have done on the budget.

Larry Cassidy asked whether or not if, in the past, project sponsors had used BPA funds for the match amount? If so, he wanted to alert the Board that the BPA is reducing its grant funding by \$40 million.

## ***Project Status Report and 4<sup>th</sup> Round Update***

Rollie Geppert provided a project management status update. (See notebook for details.)

Project staff members Brian Abbott, Mike Ramsey, and Tara Galuska provided the Board with a PowerPoint presentation of ten completed SRFB funded projects.

Dick Wallace asked why there were still so many active projects from 1999. Mr. Geppert explained these were five-year projects and the fifth year will be April of 2004.

Rollie Geppert gave the Board an update on 4<sup>th</sup> Round activities. We are now down to 213 requests due to ineligible and dropped applications. Nearshore and passage projects have gone through their first review by technical experts.

## ***Legislative Report***

Jim Fox provided the Board with a legislative update. House Bill 1446 proposes to abolish the Conservation Commission and folding it into the Department of Agriculture. The seat on the SRFB would then be the Director of Agriculture or a designee.

Senate Bill 5289 would give the SRFB the responsibility of implementing the Comprehensive Monitoring Strategy. This bill would allow state agency designees to vote on monitoring issues.

Senate Bills 5020 and 5518 would limit acquisition by state agencies to five acres or more.

House Bill 1095 and Senate Bill 5298 would assist small forest landowners in removing fish passage barriers.

Senate Bill 5347 and House Bill 1421 create a Skagit County management board that would address salmon restoration and protection on public land. The Board would be the designated lead entity for the area.

The SRFB discussed the various bills and possible ramifications to the Board.

### ***Project Changes Report***

Dick Wallace reported on the changes. Two project change requests (#00-1898C and #01-1285R) came before the subcommittee. Both were approved for change.

### **GOVERNOR'S SALMON RECOVERY OFFICE REPORT**

Steve Meyer reported on this agenda item. See notebook for details.

The GSRO is working on the release of the first three parts of the State of the Salmon report.

Met with NOAA Fisheries, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington in Portland on January 28. Mr. Meyer felt this was a very productive meeting.

Larry Cassidy asked if the Joint Natural Resource Committee (JNRC) had been disbanded. Steve Meyer reported that the JNRC could be called together to discuss salmon issues but most of the issues previously covered by JNRC are now going through the Governor's recently convened Environmental Council.

### **LEAD ENTITY ADVISORY GROUP (LEAG) REPORT**

Jay Watson and Shirley Solomon provided the Board with the first draft of the LEAG vision statement. This document was provided to the Board for its review and comment. An updated and possibly final version may be provided at the March SRFB meeting.

Larry Cassidy is concerned with the local technical review. The SRFB uses a technical review group that is unbiased and the highest of caliber.

Shirley Solomon noted that the concern is the redundancy of the reviews by both the local Technical Committee and the SRFB technical panel.

Jay Watson replied that many times the local teams feel that their work is not used with the different levels of review. Some local technical committees have very qualified scientists. Local technical committees know the watershed better.

Dick Wallace feels the vision paper is very good in that it gets the issues out and there is discussion. He does not feel the Board is ready to go with a block grant process. He would also like to see monitoring added to the vision along with what the monitoring will provide. Mr. Wallace mentioned the need to coordinate different initiatives and that the vision should note how it will work toward better coordination.

Brenda McMurray asked about the monitoring and if it should be kept at the state level.

Jay Watson agreed this is an important issue and the monitoring information could be aggregated by either the lead entity or at the state level depending on the budget.

Ed Manary noted that this document seems to recognize the different levels of maturity and that different lead entities would be able to take on more responsibilities.

Mr. Watson would like to have the Board provide the lead entities with how much funding the lead entities will receive prior to all the work going into the application process.

Bill Ruckelshaus on the vision process.

- The vision needs to move beyond efficiency and into responsibility.
- The people in the watershed need to take control of their own destiny.
- The SRFB needs to ensure accountability.
- The SRFB needs to have all interests represented at the Board and he encouraged the LEAG to continue to work on this vision.

He noted the majority of lead entities are in the Puget Sound area and development of the vision that includes all the different lead entities has been a challenge.

## **GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATION**

Director Johnson gave a brief overview of the Governor's budget recommendations to date. A January 24, 2003, letter from the Governor adjusting distribution of funding was provided to the Board.

Public Discussion:

Jim Kramer, Director of the Shared Strategy of Puget Sound and Chair of the Council of Regions, shared comments from the rest of the regions. The newest region to join the council is the Northeast Region. There are still several ESUs not covered by a regional group. Discussed the importance of the January 24, 2003 letter the Governor and that this letter needs to be distributed to the people working in the salmon arena. The Council of Regions appreciates the budget support. The SRFB needs to look at what the regions need to achieve: recovery plan, results, and recovery overall. He would like the Board to adjust the amount of funding it provides to the regional groups.

Chair Ruckelshaus asked if the purpose of a region is to develop a recovery plan and the commitment of the people in the region to support the plan.

Jim Kramer responded that each region is at a different level. The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) should have its plan completed in about a year but it is still struggling with the public commitment. The plan integrates the 4-Hs and will be used by the other regions as a model.

Brenda McMurray agrees with many of Jim Kramer's suggestions. She would like to see definitions of lead entities, regional planning, etc.

Chair Ruckelshaus doesn't believe the Board has enough information to change the budget for the regions at this time. The Board will need to decide the allotment amounts to provide each region.

Larry Cassidy noted that the NWPCC has allocated funds for watershed planning to some of the same groups as are currently working on watershed issues such as the 2496 lead entities or the 2514 watershed planners. These groups receive a format to follow and the money is for 24 months only.

Steve Tharinger believes this issue needs to be worked on soon; he is willing to work on a subcommittee.

The Board needs to find out what the regional council, lead entities, and Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups (RFEs) believe they need and then see if the Governor's budget amount works or if there is a greater need.

Laura Johnson suggested there be a working subcommittee to work on this issue. The subcommittee will need to work with GSRO, NWPCC, regional councils, RFEs and lead entities and scope out the needs.

Steve Tharinger noted that the Board needs to think of this as the cost of purchasing recovery.

Laura Johnson requested representatives from the lead entities, regional council, RFEs, NWPCC, and the SRFB for this subcommittee.

## **5<sup>TH</sup> ROUND UPDATE**

Rollie Geppert provided the Board with an update on the 5<sup>th</sup> Round process. (See notebook for details.)

There were 77 volunteers to work on the various issues. LEAG has volunteered to work on four different topics. Many lead entities are also represented on the various workgroups.

Three work groups have started their work. Three meetings are planned for each work group, more if necessary.

Chair Ruckelshaus commented that the Board makes the final decision; the workgroups will present options for the Board to review.

## **FOREST AND FISH SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Laura Johnson introduced this agenda item. (Several handouts were provided to the Board.) There has not been a subcommittee meeting on this item yet. Several bills are before the legislature at this time (HB 1095 and SB 5298) concerning forest and fish projects and passage of this legislation may answer some of the funding concerns. Director Johnson reviewed several handouts related to forest and fish process including HB1095.

Craig Partridge introduced Lenny Young and gave the Board a brief overview of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) plans.

Lenny Young, DNR small landowner program manager, briefed the Board on the DNR proposal for assisting small forest landowners.

Ed Manary asked about the definition of small forest landowner. Mr. Young explained the new definition would broaden the existing definition of small forest landowner. The amount of forested acreage owned would change to the amount of timber harvested when defining a small forest landowner.

Brenda McMurray asked about how these projects would work with the SRFB process. Would these projects be funded separately from the lead entity lists?

Mr. Young responded that they might use the lead entity process to prioritize the Forest and Fish projects through the same process as the rest of the lead entity lists.

Brenda McMurray would like to make sure these projects are part of the watershed project list and go through the same review and funding process.

## **PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES FUNDING**

Jim Fox provided the overview of this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Mr. Fox requested Board decision on the recommendations outlined in the notebook memorandum:

- Adopt guidelines in Table II for programs and activities,
- For the Fifth Round, consider funding “stand alone” monitoring projects at the reach and watershed level,
- Consider an annual grant cycle for capacity grants, coordination, and habitat and assessment projects spanning multiple lead entity areas, and
- Continue pursuing a special project to intensively monitor or otherwise assess the cumulative results of habitat restoration activities in select watersheds, and a special project to develop a statewide volunteer strategy.

The Board would like a little more scoping on the option of a 25<sup>th</sup> list or have staff include a very clear statement on what could be funded.

Brenda McMurray would like to see the final document list for those items eligible for funding as part of capacity grants.

Ms. McMurray would like to include a statement about funding projects that are deemed important to the state for salmon recovery. This would include funding of monitoring projects if they are not funded through the budget.

Brenda McMurray made a motion to adopt staff recommendation with the understanding that staff will continue to work through the details. Steve Tharinger seconded the motion. Board approved.

The Board will still need to develop a process for additional requests received throughout the year.

There being no other business the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

---

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

---

Date

Future Meetings:            March 6, 2003  
                                      NRB Room 172  
                                      Olympia, WA